

JOHN S. PANGELINAN
P.O. Box 561721
SAIPAN, MP 96900

FILED
Clerk
District Court

MAY 23 2008

Tel. # (670) 322-0322

For The Northern Mariana Islands
By _____
(Deputy Clerk)

Pro se

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

JOHN S. PANGELINAN
Plaintiff.

Civil Action No. 08-0004

v.

Cause Showing Why Pangelinan
Should Not Be Declared a
Vexatious Litigant

DAVID A. WISEMAN, et al.
Defendants,

ANGELITO TRINIDAD, et al.
Respondents.

COMES NOW, JOHN S. PANGELINAN, plaintiff prose herein after referred as "PANGELINAN", and submit this paper showing cause why he should not be held or declared a vexatious litigant.

Pangelinan incorporated herein as if herein stated all his "argument" stated in his "Consolidated Motion for Reconsideration".

from on Page 23 thru 27, which was filed with the Court on May 14, 2008. Briefly, that defendants and respondents have no standing to make such a Rule 12(b) motions and that the Court was without authority to hear the same despite the order to show cause and that they (defendants and respondents) asked for the Court aid in exercising its equitable powers with "unequal hands".

Further, as Praxilman stated on Page 23-23 of the "Consolidated Motion for Reconsideration", individual federal defendants opened the issue for discussion by their assertion of absolute judicial immunity defense. Praxilman drew his complaint as drawn in anticipation of their assertion of such a defense, and that left Praxilman with no option but to bring the matter up. Also, Praxilman, as again stated in the complaint, that a relief as prayed for be obtained in order to aid him if all the causes of the injustices, injustices and injuries that have been foisted upon him as a direct result of the continued enforcement of what is truly a void judgment of the Court in Civil Action No. 92-0073. In addition, it is because of Praxilman's desire to remove all legal consequences and civil liabilities arising from his associations on the criminal cases, which arose about as a result of enforcement, in one way or another, of Civil Action No. 92-0023. Praxilman filed a Bivens Action against the defendants for the injury they caused him, it is inevitable that he be made to run the gauntlet when he did not deserve and the injuries to himself - when in actuality it was the defendants.

The Court is well aware that Rangeliman is again, and is now presently incarcerated, for violation of his supervised release in Criminal Action No. 06-0002, under which he was convicted for Count III of obstruction of Court order -- the order that emanated from Civil Action No. 99-0073. It is this train of events and injuries upon Rangeliman that the United States of America, and its agents and employees, consistently followed through that forces Rangeliman to bring up the matter on the judgments' invalidity in Civil Action No. 99-0073 -- Rangeliman is just reacting. There was, ^{never} nor there is, an occasion for Rangeliman to bring the matter of the Court's judgment invalidity that was or is a result of his own initiative. Rather, it was crisis always brought up by Rangeliman ~~by himself~~ ^{because of the injuries or wrongs inflicted upon him. In this case, the order should really be that the United States and respondents be enjoined from further injuring or wronging Rangeliman.}

Rangeliman will be filing a Section 2255 habeas motion to obtain his release because his incarceration is illegal, *inter alia*, for the Court's lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Rangeliman has every right to file his Section 2255 habeas motion to obtain his release under 28 U.S.C. 2255 -- for Court's lack of jurisdiction. Rangeliman hopes that this be made an exception of the Court should decide to declare Rangeliman a vexatious litigant and if it could constrain Rangeliman's right to file his Section 2255 habeas motion.

The lastest thing in Rangeliman's mind is to bring a lawsuit -- against anyone, especially doing it pro se, because it is too costly and it is not anything that Rangeliman cares

John S. Pangolin
Plaintiff, pro se

Dated this 23rd day of May, 2008.

about. As far as Pangolin is concerned, if he could discharge him-
self from any court, and he be left alone, he would. As Pang-
lin told the Court at the May 07, 2008 hearing, he told that in
Civil Action No. 97-0073 he informed the sitting judge that he
would no longer appear in that Court in that case because Pan-
golin was never listened to and Plaintiff in that case always
got what they asked the Court, no matter how ridiculous it
proper their requests were. In fact, a warrant of arrest was
issued once - albeit, not executed, for Pangolin's arrest and for
him to be brought to Court, for, what he believes, him to be
chastised again by the sitting judge with his "monkey trap" example
and other things. It is for all this that his desperation he went
to the "people's court" by his publication of June 1, 2008, letter
to editor. There is truly no need that such a declaration be
made against Pangolin.